



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,559	01/19/2007	Juan Carlos Lopez Calvet	1380-0231PUS1	3554
2292 7590 07/27/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
GAO, JING				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/27/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/594,559

Applicant(s)

CALVET ET AL.

Examiner

KRISTEN GAO

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/27/2006 and 12/27/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on September 27, 2006 and December 27, 2006 were filed. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 11-17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claims 11-17 should refer to other claims in the alternative only--, and/or, -- cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 11-17 are not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 2617

Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1-10, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as been unpatentable over Hussmann (US Pub. No. 2003/0218532 A1), in view of Ritter (CA Pub. No. 2,293,393 A1).

Regarding to Claim 1, Hussmann teaches subscriber identity module for a mobile communication terminal (Paragraph 0011), comprising a processing device (Paragraph 0012; calculating means for calculating authentication code), a memory device (Paragraph 0011; memory for storing user-specific information), an I/O device (Paragraphs 0034 and 0035; interface in SIM) and a wireless communication device which is connected to an antenna included in said subscriber identity module (Paragraphs 0004 and 0029; RFID transponder is coupled to an antenna), characterized in that said wireless communication device is an interrogatable transponder (Paragraphs 0004 and 0016; RFID transponder). Hussmann may not specifically teach operatively controllable by said processing device and arranged to be operatively enabled or disabled, and controlled by a signal provided by the mobile communication terminal via said I/O device. In the same field of endeavor, Ritter teaches the SIM card controls the activation of the wireless transponder via a signal through contact region (Page 8 Lines 8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have operatively controllable by said processing device and arranged to be operatively enabled or disabled, and controlled by a signal provided by the mobile communication terminal via said I/O device because it provides more flexibility in operating the system.

Regarding to Claim 2, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 1, as described above. Further, Ritter teaches said signal is provided by a user interface in the mobile terminal (Page 13 Lines 27 to Page 14 Lines 19; user actuates a key on keypad to make a decision).

Regarding to Claim 3, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 1, as described above. Further, Ritter teaches said signal is provided by a mobile communication operator (Page 13 Lines 27 to Page 14 Lines 19; user actuates a key on keypad to make a decision).

Regarding to Claim 4, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 1, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said interrogatable transponder comprises identification data contained in a memory, said identification data being configurable by said processing device (Paragraphs 0009 and 0011; the SIM is characterized by means for writing user-specific information into the transponder memory unit).

Regarding to Claim 5, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 4, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said identification data is provided by the mobile communication terminal via said I/O device (Paragraphs 0011 and 0035; the interface allows processor to write user-specific information into the transponder memory and to read information from memory).

Regarding to Claim 6, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 5, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said identification data is provided by a mobile communication operator (Paragraph 0050; user-specific information may be manually entered into a portable electronic device by using various user interfaces).

Regarding to Claim 7, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 1, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said interrogatable transponder is arranged to transmit a RF signal coded with said identification data when interrogated by an external interrogating RF device (Paragraph 0029; the interrogating apparatus transmits a request radio signal, emitted as an electromagnetic field, picked up by transponder that causes the transponder to transmit a reply signal comprising identification data through antenna).

Regarding to Claim 8, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of one of the Claims 1-7, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said transponder is an active RFID transponder (Paragraphs 0016 and 0030; active RFID transponder).

Regarding to Claim 9, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 8, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said transponder is a separate device (Figure 2), comprising a processing device, a memory device and an I/O device connected to an antenna (Paragraph 0029; the active RFID transponder comprises an antenna, an integrated circuit and memory).

Regarding to Claim 10, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 9, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said transponder comprises an antenna (Paragraph 0029; the active RFID transponder comprises an antenna), and wherein further RFID transponder functionality is implemented by means of the processing device and the memory device included in said subscriber identity module (Paragraphs 0009 and 0011; the SIM is characterized by means of processing device and memory device for writing user-specific information into the transponder memory unit).

Regarding to Claim 18, Hussmann teaches a method for execution by a subscriber identity module, for the purpose of providing secure data communication between the subscriber identity module and an external interrogating device (Abstract), said subscriber identity module comprising a processing device (Paragraph 0012; calculating means for calculating authentication code), a memory device containing a private key (Paragraphs 0011 and 0041-0043; memory for storing user-specific information, which includes SRES), an I/O device (Paragraphs 0034 and 0035; interface in SIM), and a wireless communication device which is connected to an antenna included in said subscriber identity module (Paragraphs 0004 and 0029; RFID transponder is coupled to an antenna), the wireless communication device being an interrogatable transponder (Paragraphs 0004 and 0016; RFID transponder), said method comprising the steps of transmitting identification data upon an interrogation by the external interrogating device (Paragraph 0029; the interrogating apparatus transmits a request radio signal, emitted as an electromagnetic field, picked up by transponder that causes the transponder to transmit a reply signal comprising identification data through antenna), receiving an encrypted message from the external communication device, said message being encrypted with a public key associated with said identification data (Paragraph 0042; the interrogating apparatus emits a signal comprising a RAND-number),

Art Unit: 2617

decrypting said encrypted message using said private key (Paragraph 0041; decrypt the message based on Ki and RAND using algorithm A3), and using the decrypted message as a shared key to encrypt further data communication between the subscriber identity module and the external interrogating device (Paragraph 0042; the transponder and the interrogating apparatus transmits signals containing SRES). Hussmann may not specifically teach operatively controllable by said processing device and arranged to be operatively enabled or disabled, controlled by a signal provided by the mobile communication terminal via said I/O device. In the same field of endeavor, Ritter teaches the SIM card controls the activation of the wireless transponder via a signal through contact region (Page 8 Lines 8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have operatively controllable by said processing device and arranged to be operatively enabled or disabled, and controlled by a signal provided by the mobile communication terminal via said I/O device because it provides more flexibility in operating the system.

Regarding to Claim 19, the combination of Hussmann and Ritter teaches all of the limitations of Claim 18, as described above. Further, Hussmann teaches said public key is provided by said external interrogating device by searching a database in order to match said identification with the corresponding public key (Paragraphs 0044-0046; interrogating apparatus obtains a RAND by first obtaining the user identity through database).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTEN GAO whose telephone number is (571)270-7226. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617	/KRISTEN GAO/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617 07/21/2009
--	---